

1 RICHARD A. JONES (BAR No. 135248)  
2 E-MAIL: RJONES@COV.COM  
3 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
4 1 FRONT STREET  
5 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
6 TELEPHONE: (415) 591-6000  
7 FAXSIMILE: (415) 591-6091

8 THOMAS S. WILLIAMSON, JR. (*PRO HAC VICE*)  
9 E-MAIL: TWILLIAMSON@COV.COM  
10 SHIMICA D. GASKINS (*PRO HAC VICE*)  
11 E-MAIL: SGASKINS@COV.COM  
12 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
13 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.  
14 WASHINGTON, DC 20004  
15 TELEPHONE: (202) 662-6000  
16 FAXSIMILE: (202) 662-6291

17 ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
18 GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

---

DAVID MOORE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. CV 07-3850 SI

**DEFENDANT'S INDIVIDUAL  
STATEMENT REGARDING  
DISCOVERY DISPUTE  
CONCERNING PLAINTIFF'S  
SUBPOENA TO DAEGIS, INC.**

Judge: Honorable Susan Y. Illston

1

**DEFENDANT'S INDIVIDUAL STATEMENT**  
**REGARDING DISCOVERY DISPUTE**  
**CONCERNING PLAINTIFF'S SUBPOENA TO DAEGIS, INC.**

2

3

4 Gilead Sciences, Inc. ("Gilead") respectfully brings to the Court's attention that on  
 5 August 25, 2011, in response to Gilead's Motion for Sanctions, Plaintiff served a subpoena on  
 6 Daegis, Inc., Gilead's third-party e-discovery vendor. The subpoena requests: 1) "All  
 7 documents provided by [Daegis] to Gilead Sciences, Inc., in relation to David Moore or this  
 8 litigation;" 2) All documents sent by [Daegis] to Gilead Sciences, pertaining to any subpoena  
 9 issued by the U.S. Dept. of Justice" ("DOJ")<sup>1</sup>; and 3) "All documents [Daegis] used to conduct  
 10 any search for relevant documents and when these searches were done." *See* Ex. A. The parties  
 11 have met and conferred and are at an impasse regarding the subpoena. Gilead is seeking the  
 12 Court's assistance to prevent Plaintiff's abuse of the discovery process by seeking documents in  
 13 a manner that would effectively nullify the normal limits on discovery that protect litigants from  
 14 having to disclose irrelevant, nonresponsive, or privileged documents. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P.  
 15 26(b)(1). Specifically, Gilead requests that the Court quash this extraordinary and overreaching  
 16 subpoena pursuant to Federal Rules 26 and 45.

17

18 By way of background, Gilead retained Daegis, an e-discovery vendor, in connection  
 19 with this litigation to act as its agent by hosting Gilead's documents for review and production  
 20 by outside counsel. The documents retained by Daegis are Gilead's documents; Daegis is  
 21 merely storing them. Gilead objects to their disclosure for several reasons.

22 *First*, Plaintiff's subpoena is unduly burdensome because it seeks information that is  
 23 both duplicative and cumulative of Gilead's document productions. Gilead has produced  
 24 relevant, nonprivileged documents in the normal course of discovery. To date, Gilead's  
 25 production has exceeded 70,000 documents. Plaintiff, therefore, is not entitled to duplicate  
 26 documents from a nonparty. *See Nidec Corp. v. Victor Co.*, 249 F.R.D. 575, 577 (N.D. Cal.  
 27

---

28 <sup>1</sup> Gilead notes that Daegis was not involved in the investigation conducted by the DOJ.

1 2007) (quashing nonparty subpoena because the requested documents were duplicative and thus  
 2 were not “unique and material evidence”).

3 *Second*, the subpoena is manifestly overbroad on its face. The subpoena requests *all*  
 4 documents. Every document that Gilead retained, collected, or reviewed is obviously not  
 5 relevant to this litigation. Like irrelevant documents, Plaintiff is also not entitled to privileged  
 6 documents. Plaintiff’s request for documents “used to conduct any search for relevant  
 7 documents” seems particularly designed to obtain access to attorney work product. Indeed, the  
 8 extraordinary scope of the subpoena necessarily encompasses documents to which Gilead has a  
 9 valid claim of attorney-client privilege and attorney work product. Plaintiff has not made *any*  
 10 threshold showing of relevance or special need that could conceivably justify requiring such  
 11 sweeping and wide-ranging disclosure of Gilead’s documents.

12 In sum, Plaintiff’s subpoena is nothing more than an improper attempt to use Gilead’s  
 13 motion for sanctions to circumvent the normal discovery rules excluding access to irrelevant,  
 14 nonresponsive, and privileged documents in order to conduct a fishing expedition. Accordingly,  
 15 this Court should quash the subpoena.

16  
 17 DATED: September 16, 2011  
 18

19 By: /s/ Shimica D. Gaskins  
 20 SHIMICA D. GASKINS (*PRO HAC VICE*)  
 21 THOMAS S. WILLIAMSON, JR. (*PRO HAC VICE*)  
 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
 1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.  
 WASHINGTON, DC 20004  
 22 TELEPHONE: (202) 662-6000  
 FAX: (202) 662-6291  
 SGASKINS@COV.COM  
 TWILLIAMSON@COV.COM

23  
 24 RICHARD A. JONES (BAR No. 135248)  
 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
 1 FRONT STREET  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
 25 TELEPHONE: (415) 591-6000  
 FAX: (415) 591-6091  
 RJONES@COV.COM  
 26 Attorneys for Defendant Gilead Sciences, Inc.  
 27  
 28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Shimica D. Gaskins, Esq., certify that on this date, I electronically filed the foregoing document using the CM/ECF system which will send a notification to all the attorneys of record.

Dated: September 16, 2011

/S/ Shimica D. Gaskins  
SHIMICA D. GASKINS (*PRO HAC VICE*)  
EMAIL: SGASKINS@COV.COM  
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004  
TELEPHONE: (202) 662-6000  
FACSIMILE: (202) 662-6291